Vol. V., No. 12. MARCH, 1916.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

A Monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of TRUTH, FREEDOM, and PROGRESS in the Church of England.

"By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance."—*Erasmus.*

"A State without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation."—*Edmund Burke.*

EDITOR: REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A.

CONTENTS.

THE VITAL NEED.—By the EDITOR.

A NATIONAL MISSION.—By the Rev. A. J. HUMPHREYS, B.D.

ARE OUR DIVISIONS ESSENTIAL? By the Rev. Canon MITCHELL, M.A.

ROBERTSON OF BRIGHTON.—By the Rev. FELIX ASHER, B.D.

OXFORD THEOLOGY.—By the Rev. Canon B. H. STREETER.

THE OUTFIT OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN (III.) By the Rev. W. A. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG, M.A.

A SPIRITUAL CONFLICT.—By the Rev. Canon DANKS, M.A.

REVIEW.—Mr. Balfour's "Theism and Humanism." By the Rev. Canon RASHDALL, D.C.L., F.B.A.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

CORRESPONDENCE.—The Incarnation and the Virgin Birth.
Through the Merits of Christ.
Church Teaching in Church Schools.

PRAYER FOR ABSENT FRIENDS.

Library of the PACIFIC UNITARIAN SCHOOL FOR THE MINISTRY Berkeley, California

Printer and Publisher: WILLIAM PARR, Knaresborough.

London Agents:—WILLIAMS & NORGATE, 14, Henrietta Street, W.C.
ELLIOT STOCK, 7, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Price 6d. net. Annual Subscription, 5/- (including postage).

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS HALL.]

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President:—Professor GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

The Right Hon. LORD GREY, G.C.M.G., G.C.B., 22, South St., Park Lane W.
Sir C. THOMAS DYKE-ACLAND, Bart., Holnicote, Taunton, Somerset.
PHILIP H. BAGENAL, Esq., Harrogate.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq., 62, Fellows Road, N.W.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, Seaford Vicarage, Sussex.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, Rest, Hodford Road, Golders Green, N.W.
The Rev. Professor HENSLOW, Danehurst, Branksome Wood Road, Bournemouth.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, Harvard University, U.S.A.
The Rev. W. MANNING, The Rectory, Chipping Barnet, Herts.
The Rev. Dr. MORRISON, The Rectory, Marylebone, W.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, Acrise, Hall Place Gardens, St. Albans.
The Rev. Canon H. RASHDALL, Litt.D., F.B.A., New College, Oxford.
Sir E. RUSSELL, 5, Croxteth Road, Liverpool.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq., 1, Wellington Street, Strand, London, W.C.
The Rev. Dr. SYMONDS, Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal, Canada.

Members of the Council:

Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, The College, Ely (*Chairman*).

Rev. Dr. DUKENFIELD ASTLEY.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL.
Rev. Canon BANNISTER.
Rev. A. N. BAX.
Rev. J. H. C. B. de CANDOLE.
Prof. M. A. CANNEY.
Mr. F. C. CHANNING.
Rev. W. A. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG.
Rev. Canon CREMER.
Prof. CRUICKSHANK.
Rev. H. DALE.
Rev. Canon W. DANKS.
Rev. J. A. DODD.
Rev. W. A. EDWARDS.
Rev. C. W. EMMET.
Rev. Canon FOAKES-JACKSON.
Rev. JOHN GAMBLE.
Mr. W. B. GORDON.
Rev. H. HANDLEY.
Rev. J. M. JEAKES.
Rev. H. LAURENCE.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR.
Rev. W. MANNING.
Rev. R. G. MILBURN.
Rev. J. LLOYD MILNE.
Rev. Dr. MORRISON.
Rev. CAVENDISH MOXON.
Very Rev. ARNOLD PAGE.
Rev. Canon PAPILLON.
Rev. Canon RASHDALL.
Mrs. REITH.
Rev. H. G. ROSEDALE.
Rev. T. F. ROYDS.
Rev. C. J. SHARP.
Rev. C. R. SHAW-STEWART.
Rev. A. H. STANWAY.
Sir RICHARD STAPLEY.
Rev. J. E. SYMES.
Rev. J. M. THOMPSON.
Rev. Dr. R B. TOLLINTON.
Prof. A. G. WIDGERY.
Rev. J. R. WILKINSON.
Rev. FERGUS WOOD.
Miss YOUNGHUSBAND.

Hon. Treasurer:—Sir RICHARD STAPLEY, 33, Bloomsbury Square, W.C.
Hon. Auditor.—ROBERT WARNER, Esq., F.C.A., 10, Walbrook, E.C.
Hon. Secretary.—Rev. C. MOXON, M.A., Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorkshire.
Hon. Assistant Secretaries.—Miss. D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Rev. J. M. JEAKES, Llanfoist, Clifton Downs, Bristol.

OBJECTS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church to restate her belief from time to time as required by the progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit.
2.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness and corporate life of the Church of England, and her Christian spirit of tolerance in all things non-essential.
3.—To give all support in their power to those who are honestly and loyally endeavouring to vindicate the truths of Christianity by the light of scholarship and research; and while paying due regard to continuity, to work for such changes in the formularies and practices in the Church of England as from time to time are made necessary by the needs and knowledge of the day.
4.—To assert the rights and duties of the laity as constituent members of the Body of Christ.
5.—To encourage friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

Annual Subscription:—Members at least 5/-; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. These should be paid to **Rev. C. Moxon,** Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorks.

"THE MODERN CHURCHMAN."

***The Modern Churchman*, the monthly organ of the Churchmen's Union, is sent *free* to all full members of the Union, and to non-members at a charge of 5/- per annum.**

Editor:—Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A., Copgrove Rectory, Burton Leonard, Harrogate, to whom all literary contributions are to be sent.

Business Manager:—Rev. C. MOXON, M.A., Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorkshire, receives all subscriptions, advts., changes of address, &c., for the *Modern Churchman*.

	Page
The Vital Need	585
A National Mission	590
Are our Divisions Essential?	595
Robertson of Brighton	602
Oxford Theology	610
The Outfit of a Modern Churchman (III.)	614
A Spiritual Conflict	618
Review—Mr. Balfour's "Theism and Humanism"	623
Churchmen's Union News	629
Correspondence—The Incarnation and the Virgin Birth	630
Through the Merits of Christ	631
Church Teaching in Church Schools	632
Prayer for Absent Friends	632

CURACY WANTED by C.U. member. Young, fond of visiting and preaching. Nine years' teaching experience in secondary school. Apply R., c/o Rev. C. Moxon, Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorks.

of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 12. MARCH, 1916. Vol. V.

THE VITAL NEED.

By the Editor.

The Vicar introduced the subject of the National Mission of Repentance and Hope at the meeting of the Parish Council, and enquired whether any member present had heard anything about it. "Yes," replied the People's Warden, "a few of us talked about it last market day, and we thought it ought to begin with the clergy." The story is true, and it probably represents in many cases the inarticulate feeling of most of the laity who have given any thought to the subject. Not a few parishioners feel that if their clergyman were the slave of fewer fads, failings, and fallacies, if he were more sympathetic, more human, more active, not to say more eloquent, things would certainly go better. No doubt they are right. Some few think that if he were only more like Christ almost anything might happen. These are doubly right. But although reforms in the characters and lives of the clergy might do something to raise the moral and religious standard of the nation, the result would not be so great as some people might anticipate. We know excellent clergymen whose lives are self-sacrificing, and their activities numerous, and yet their religious and moral influence in their communities is very small indeed.

The fact is that it is reform of the Church which is needed as a preliminary to the revival of national religion. The clergy are to a large extent the product of a system, and they are the agents of a system, but if that system be obsolete or inadequate, although you may succeed in producing some reforms in the character and conduct of the clergy, you will have done very little towards influencing the national life as a whole. The Church needs not missions but reforms.

We, modern Churchmen, comparatively few in number, and having no control worth speaking of over the machinery of the Church, have pressed upon our authorities for some years past—in season and out of season—mostly out of season—the need for Church reforms, but without any tangible results—save it be this—that many of our fellow-clergymen are now beginning to awaken to the same need. There are most cheering signs of this in recent issues of the *Challenge*. But to effect reforms is no easy matter in a huge body like the National Church, split up as it is by party feeling, weighed down by obscurantism, drifting or rather being towed against the tide on to the quick-sands of mediaevalism. Reformation demands not only great courage and great skill in our leaders, it also demands considerable time. We have had years to give to the task, but little has been accomplished. The day of judgment is at hand, and we are all unprepared to meet it. Once again, as in the past, the Church is about to be taken in hand—not by her bishops—but by the nation—probably by a Henry VIII., a Thomas and Oliver Cromwell, a Lord Brougham, and a Mr. Lloyd George all rolled into one in the form of some rough and ready Labour Premier, and the Church will stand as much chance of escape from that grasp as Gulliver from the hand of a Brobdingnagian. Then as a national institution, the Church—to the joy of our mediaevalists and crypto-Romans—will be not mended but ended.

The only thing that can save the Church is reform. The days of Turkish diplomacy are at an end. Agitators may grow old and weary; reformers may be judiciously suppressed or promoted, but it is impossible to stave off Nemesis. The eternal laws of God, His laws of truth and righteousness, of love and progress, must prevail. Institutions and communities which ignore and oppose them, meet their inevitable doom. Reformation too long with-held becomes destructive revolution.

How much time remains to the Church none can say. All are agreed that it is not much. She is steadily losing her moral and religious ascendancy as she has lost her intellectual

ascendancy in the nation. Nothing can save her except reforms—and reforms of a much deeper and more extensive and troublesome character than those proposed by the Church Reform League. But how can these reforms be accomplished? Our representative Church assemblies have failed utterly. There is only one to whom we can look to inaugurate reformation on an adequate scale and to see that it is carried through, and that is the Primate of All England. Directly and indirectly, the Primate's powers are very great. If the Primate has the conscience of the nation with him, he can afford to ignore, and we believe that he will do well to ignore, even large groups of ecclesiastics in his *entourage,* who are opposed to reforms. Let him feel the national, not the ecclesiastical, pulse in this matter, and act accordingly. The highest law in such a crisis as we are approaching, is the safety of the society. The very existence of the Church as a national, moral, and religious force, is now threatened. Not the mobilisation of our spiritual forces in some vast and unworkable committee or combination of committees, can deal adequately with the situation, but the concentration of those forces in the personal leadership of the Primate seems to offer the only hope of salvation. If his Grace would undertake the needful policy of reform on comprehensive lines, Parliament, Press, and popular feeling, would all support him in his endeavours.

Let us, however, be quite clear on this point, that there is no use in offering the nation a national mission when what it really wants are reforms in the National Church. Pious appeals, emotional orations, condemnations of intemperance and impurity, invitations to come to church and to make regular use of the means of grace, exhortations to be more humble and less critical, vague demands for social righteousness, are not going to meet the situation. Church Reform is what the nation demands. The demand may be largely negative and inarticulate, but it is clearly understood by those who are not bemused by clerical platitudes and ecclesiastical fallacies.

We know that it will be urged that the Church has been doing her best to achieve reforms, and that she has achieved many. She has improved her parochial and diocesan system by creating new parishes and new dioceses. Her methods of finance exhibit enormous improvement. No doubt this is true. But when the nation demands Parliamentary Reform it is not satisfied with re-roofing the houses of Parliament, providing uniform and adequate salaries for members of the House of Commons, with ample pensions on their retirement. Still less does it include in its demand an increase in the number of the members of both Houses. Members of Parliament may fondly fancy that this is what the nation means by Parliamentary Reform, but the nation knows better. The nation means by Parliamentary Reform that Parliament shall more adequately and ably voice the intelligence and conscience of the nation, and realise its function in the form of swift and effective legislation combined with a rigorous oversight of the administration in all the great public departments. When the modern Churchman in the name of the nation demands Church Reform, he demands that the Church shall really voice the moral and religious aspirations of the nation, and transmute those aspirations into intelligent and practical forms for the regeneration of the national life.

What are these reforms? it may be asked. We have voiced them repeatedly. They are:—

(1) Reforms in our Church Services, so as to render them simple, truthful, practical, popular, flexible.

(2) Reform in our training of Ordinands so as to produce a body of large-hearted, modern-minded clergymen, who would be Christians and patriots first, and Churchmen and clergymen second.

(3) Reform in the mode of appointment of all parochial clergymen by which the parishioners' needs and wishes would be allowed due expression in such appointments.

(4) Reform in the Church's representative assemblies, beginning with the establishment of Parochial Councils

with legal powers enabling them to exercise a constitutional control over parochial services and organizations.

(5) Reform in the Church's doctrinal formularies, leading to their immense simplification and modernisation, so that conscientious Christian men of strong moral and religious feeling and exceptional power should not be excluded from her ministry as at present.

These fivefold reforms are what we need, and let us face the fact that none of our at present clerically controlled representative Church bodies are going to give us them. The Primate, backed by the nation, can alone do it, or it will not be done at all.

But let it be clearly understood that only such reforms as we have indicated in broad outline can save the Church as a national institution. Only such reforms carried out in no tinkering spirit will enable many Englishmen of good-will who at present regard the Church with indifference or even with contempt and aversion to turn to her as a great national asset for the regenerating of our moral and social and religious life.

We, modern Churchmen have no objection to a National Mission—the success of that mission depends, as we pointed out last month, upon the religious, moral, and intellectual ascendancy of those who conduct it, but let it be clearly realised that Missions cannot take the place of Reforms. It is easier to confess one's sins than it is to amend one's life. But Reforms are what the present situation demands. Missions may well follow or precede or accompany reforms as tears in the case of some persons are united with change in conduct and character, but National Missions cannot take the place of reforms in the National Church.

We hope—perhaps almost against hope—that in this most critical situation—the Church's policy will not seem to justify the taunt of the Bishop of Zanzibar that as a body she exists for the shirking of vital issues.

A NATIONAL MISSION.

By the Rev. A. J. Humphreys, B.D., Vicar of St. Paul's, Accrington.

We have now a scheme in operation. The Church of England will have its National Mission in October and November, and it is hoped "that the leaders of other religious communities will make arrangements in their own way for an independent effort kindred to our own." Organisation is in progress, and the general title is fixed. It will be "The National Mission of Repentance and Hope."

The important thing is the message of the Mission. To make anything like a national appeal we must feel the pulse of the nation, find out its needs, voice its unexpressed desires, call out its deepest emotions, touch its heart, appeal to its mind, stimulate its will. There are many who are hoping and praying that before long England may experience a real religious revival. A National Mission may prelude the change, or it may leave us cold. Religious men of all schools desire a quickening of our religious forces, though they may not agree as to the methods and aims to be sought. Can any appeal touch us all?

The title "Mission of Repentance and Hope" is not striking. It does not seem to sound the note of confidence that would arouse enthusiasm. It looks almost as if we were afraid of the word "repentance," for fear it should seem to express condemnation of our share in the war. So we add the word "hope," which is not strictly connected with the other, and awakens a somewhat different train of thought. Is it hope for the sinful that they may have power, or for the bereaved that they may be comforted, or for the nation that it may reach forward to higher things, or for Europe that it may find a lasting and abiding peace? It arouses all these thoughts, and it may to some extent be correlated in all departments with the word "repentance," though it is not easy to see how repentance gives direct hope to the afflicted and bereaved.

There is room for different interpretations and methods, and if the parochial clergy are to be left to do most of the work, as seems likely, perhaps this is well. But one would have liked an appeal based on some special point, a key-word giving the note of the whole mission, on which thought could have been concentrated. "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who will prepare himself for the battle?" A trumpet-call is what the nation needs, a clear leading, a call to a new life—the life of the Spirit.

One would like to suggest a sub-title of the Mission,—"A Call to a New Life." It touches all. It is what every individual wants. It is what the nation unconsciously desires; it appeals to the whole man; it calls forth our best; it stimulates our repentance; it tells the bereaved of the higher life; it calls the nation and Europe—yea, mankind—to greater vision, prayer, effort; it puts before us the great ideal of what the world may become. It gives voice to all our yearnings, it fills with enthusiasm, hope, zeal; and the vision of what may be in contrast with what is at present intensifies the repentance of individuals, churches, nations, and continents.

For we are all realising now that it is just here where we have been most lacking—in true life, the life of the Spirit. For fifty years past we have concentrated all our attention on the material life. Science has had a materialistic emphasis. The great triumphs of science have been chemical, physical, biological. We have had to realise afresh that we are of the earth, earthy. Man's relationship to the brutes has had to be traced. The materialistic emphasis has coloured all our vision. Industry and commerce have absorbed our faculties; hidden possibilities of natural things have been brought into use. We have been engaged in making ourselves lords of nature—the earth, the sea, the air. What wonder if common thought has tended to make life consist in the abundance of things which a man possesses? Our very philosophy has taken a materialistic tinge, and religious organisation has become more and more steeped in the wisdom of the world.

But a change has come over the minds of men. Materialism is seen to be bankrupt. It provides no solution of the great problems of life, and can proclaim no gospel. The will to power only ends in catastrophic war; civilisation crumbles about our ears. There is something wrong, not with the powers of man, but the spirit of man. We want a fresh spirit. Nothing can bring peace in the world but a fresh spirit in the hearts of men. The spirit after all is the one thing all-important, and only a true spirit can utilise our powers in the right way. The world requires not so much more scientific or educational power to-day as a new way of looking at life. It requires conversion to a new life, a new spirit.

Religious men of all schools and denominations agree on this point. The politician, the trade unionist, the social reformer, men and women, all agree on this. The only point is: How can the new spirit come?

Science has been preparing the way; its leaders have been becoming more and more interested in the spirit of man; psychology has taken the place of biology in the general interest, and psychic research is at least respectable, and has leaders of known reputation. Philosophy has taken us away from mere materialistic phenomena; evolution is seen to be creative evolution. Our great doubt now is whether there be such a thing as matter, or whether after all it is at bottom a spiritual thing. Dramatists, poets, and novelists go deep into the mind of man, and speak of the driving-power of the innate life-force, the urge of the spirit, which impels us even when we are least conscious of it. The Poet Laureate leaves his own verse to collect all that the poets have said about "The Spirit of Man." One of our leading politicians voices in University lectures the wide-spread feeling that there is something in the spirit of man—ordinary man—that goes beyond all that science or philosophy can conceive, and that calls imperatively for God.

The field is ready to our hand. The harvest is ripe. It only needs the skilful and patient reaper. England, France, Belgium, Russia, Servia, Germany, America, are waiting the

call to a new life. China, Japan, India, are feeling the birth-throes of a new world. Mankind is waking up from worldly slumber, and asks: What is my calling? Here is the only answer that can satisfy: "The mind of the Spirit is life and peace"; "In these things is the life of my spirit"; "The spirit is life because of righteousness"; "Life is more than meat, and the body than raiment"; "For a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth"; "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by everything that proceedeth out of the mouth of God"; "For the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit."

Every revival has its own special point of emphasis in theology, and it is generally found in something that has previously been neglected. If one were to pick out any point of peculiar importance for the world just now, one thinks it would be the Spirit of God and the spirit of man, and their intimate union one with another. And the passage in the old Scriptures that would seem to be of supreme importance is Romans viii., 3-39. Here we have all our science, our philosophy, our poetry, our higher criticism, our new theology, our social yearnings, all the instincts of ordinary men, brought to their culminating point—the life of the Spirit. The mind of the Spirit alone bringing life and peace; the spirit of man being the dwelling place of the Spirit of God, who works out the Divine purposes through the spirit of man, though it is often voiceless and cannot recognise its inheritance; the Spirit of God in us and through us bringing us at last to the glorious liberty of ihe children of God, and the glory that shall be revealed; the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord manifesting itself in complete human redemption through the Spirit of God in the spirit of man.

From the human standpoint we start with the spirit of man, and the spirit of man is ready, waiting for the call. In theology we have to revive the truths hidden away in the third paragraphs of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. "I believe in the

Holy Spirit, the Lord, and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son" (the channel of all creative and redemptive power), "Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified" (there is no collect in our Prayer Book addressed to the Holy Spirit), "Who spake by the prophets" (the spiritual seers of the race). "And I believe One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church" (the Spirit of God as the foundation of all human unity, based on the doing of God's will, binding all nations together in one human brotherhood, in the recognition of God's call to be the apostles of the Divine revelation), "The Communion of Saints" (the life of the Spirit alone can link us with souls either in this world or the world to come); "I believe in one baptism for the Forgiveness of Sins" (for baptism is meaningless unless it be the baptism of the Spirit, making us spiritually, like all the rites of the Church, the children of God); "And I look for the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Life of the World to come" (nothing except sin can kill the spirit of man; its destiny is eternal progress towards the Divine perfection).

Here we have the Life, the Character, the Method, and the Aim of the Spirit; Justification, Atonement, Redemption, through the Spirit; and all indissolubly linked up with the spirit of man, which is the "candle of the Lord."

The religious world has not by any means yet grasped these truths. We have altogether too much of the life of the flesh, and of the world. The study of Comparative Religion, perhaps, especially in Hinduism and Buddhism, has prepared the way for the emphasising of the life of the spirit in quietness, meditation, thought, renunciation, poverty. How many good and earnest men have accused the Church of England of being false to the Spirit of Christ, and how true we all know it to be. The Labour world has begun to speak far more of the Spirit of Christ; and not a few of the leaders of the Labour Movement are spiritual leaders who know and confess openly that none of the material reforms which they urge can fully satisfy—they are but the means for subserving the higher ends of real human

life, and are required to give freer play to the higher yearnings of humanity. Philosophy calls imperatively to the only real Rock on which we can take our stand,—the spirit of man linked with the All-creating Spirit of the universe.

Here is our message. Let us trumpet it forth. Its fruits will soon be seen—the fruits we need—love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance. Repentance is the preliminary, but repentance can only come when the vision is seen. When that vision is seen, and the Power recognised through which the vision may be brought to realisation, then shall we begin to be "delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

ARE OUR DIVISIONS ESSENTIAL?*

By the Rev. Canon R. A. Mitchell, M.A., Southampton.

Our unhappy divisions—are they essential or accidental? Are the things, the causes, the conditions that divide Christendom to-day permanent, necessary, irremovable, essential; or are they in the nature of accidents—things which could be removed if only we were wise enough to discover the right way in which to remove them? I may be told at the very outset that the question is one which does not really lie open to debate. If the divisions of Christendom are plainly contrary to the Divine Will, as we all believe them to be, then it is unthinkable that their causes could be irremovable; and in so far as these divisions are in their origin intellectual, in so far as they arise from the varying apprehension and the varying interpretation of truth, it only needs that the truth should be rightly apprehended, and rightly interpreted, in order to resolve our differences and

* A Paper read to a small Society of Clergy and Ministers of all Denominations at Southampton.

establish a unity of belief and practice. If, in other words, we are divided simply and solely because we do not, or will not, know the truth, then in pursuing the path of knowledge we are inevitably approaching the goal of reunion, and theoretically, at any rate, that goal cannot be regarded as unattainable.

But here, we are at once confronted with another and a larger question, which may take us, I think, more closely down to the root of the matter. It is related of James McNeill Whistler that on one occasion he was talking to a friend, and announcing with his accustomed freedom some rather vigorous opinions about a particular work of art. "Well," his friend observed, after Whistler had said his say, "after all, it's a matter of taste." "On the contrary," Whistler answered, "it is a matter of knowledge." Now, if the painter was right, and it was indeed a matter of knowledge, then, of course, Mr. Whistler's friend had only to attain to Mr. Whistler's knowledge in order to agree precisely with Mr. Whistler's judgment. But if, on the other hand, the friend was right, and if it was indeed in any smallest measure a matter of taste, of temperamental preference, of personal choice, then there is no reason in the world why those two men should ever agree in their estimate of that picture. In precisely the same way it seems to me that the question: Are our divisions essential or accidental, permanent or transitory, removable or irremovable? must depend on the larger and the deeper question: Are they in their essence a matter of knowledge, or are they a matter of taste? If the first, then with every approximation to perfect knowledge they must tend to disappear; if the second, I see no reason why they should ever disappear, because varieties of taste, differences of personal preference, may be as indestructible as personality itself.

I approach then, with fear and trembling, this larger question: Are our divisions in their essence intellectual, or are they temperamental, a matter of knowledge or a matter of taste? Obviously there is something to be said, a very great deal to be said, for either conclusion; and first we observe that the causes

which do actually seem to separate us to-day are apparently intellectual rather than temperamental. The great question of Church order and government is a case in point. There may be some who prefer on grounds of personal taste, the Episcopalian, or the Presbyterian, or the Congregational form of ecclesiastical organisation, but I take it that there is no one who would urge his own preference in this matter, if it could be reasonably demonstrated that any one of these systems had behind it the express authority of Jesus Christ. We only want to be assured that one particular form of Church polity is the right form, or the best form, to agree at once in our acceptance of it. The same thing applies with even greater force to formularies of belief. If it could be proved to demonstration that the Westminster Confession, or the decrees of the Council of Trent, or the Anglican Church Catechism does in fact express the truth of the Christian revelation, then the whole of Christendom would be prepared at once to accept any one of these formularies. The reason why I cannot accept certain articles of the Westminster Confession is not because I do not like them, but because I do not think that they are true.

Of the question of Establishment or State control, I say nothing, because in comparison with these larger matters it seems to be of trifling importance; but again, it can hardly be regarded as a matter of taste, and as a cause of our unhappy divisions it is obviously accidental. So then, if we have regard to those questions which seem to be most important, which overshadow all others in popular religious controversy and debate, questions of belief and of Church order, we may well be drawn to the conclusion that our unhappy divisions are in their essence intellectual rather than temperamental, a matter of knowledge rather than a matter of taste. And in so far as this is the case, we may surely hope and believe that with the fuller knowledge which must issue from a more sincere and unselfish quest of truth, and a greater readiness to admit mistakes and renounce errors, the harsher lines of our divisions will at least tend to disappear.

In so far as that is the case, if it be true that we are divided on lines of intellectual difference; but, after all is said, I am not yet quite convinced that that is the case. I am not convinced because, in the first place, my own experience points to an opposite conclusion. If you ask me why I belong to one particular Christian society, and not to another, and if I am to speak quite frankly, my answer must be that I belong to this particular society because I prefer it, because I like it best, because on the whole it seems to suit my taste, and answer to my needs. I shrewdly suspect that in giving that answer I shall not stand alone. If you go up to the first person you meet in the street, and ask him why he goes to a Roman Catholic Church, or a Baptist Church, or to no Church at all, he may tell you that his father and mother did it before him, and he was brought up that way. But if you press him a little further he will probably admit that he has taken the way that suits him best; he has followed the direction, not of his reason, but of his taste.

Possibly the same conclusion may appear if we extend our outlook to a larger field. I suppose that if we regard Christendom as a whole, there is some ground for accepting as a fact that one great line of cleavage which is broadly indicated to-day by the words Catholic and Protestant. The line itself is ill defined and wavering, and broken at many places. We observe much confusion at the point of contact, and all sorts of irregular companies, who might seem equally at home on either side; but broadly, the thing is real. There is this division, and I am inclined to think it is the only division that matters very much. Let us examine it for one moment, and again with the same object in view, to determine, if we can, whether its cause is intellectual or temperamental, a matter of knowledge or a matter of taste.

I need hardly remind you that this line of cleavage is a very ancient one; it appears almost as far back as the records enable us to travel in the history of religious thought and practice. If the critics are right, we come upon it in the first two chapters

of the Bible. We have there two accounts of the creation of the world, one of them written by a priest, the other by a prophet; one from the Catholic, and the other from the Protestant point of view; and all through the Old Testament Scriptures we can trace the same contrast which appears at the beginning. The antagonism is often strongly marked, and except, perhaps, in the book of the priest-prophet Ezekiel, there is not much attempt to reconcile the opposing view points. The Dean of St. Paul's has observed somewhere, in his characteristic way, that there is only one place in the Old Testament in which the priest and the prophet are said to be in agreement, and that is when the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means.

This line of cleavage, then, is a very ancient, as well as a very real one; we can study it throughout the whole recorded history of natural and revealed religion, but it is extraordinarily difficult to discover a formula which will in any true measure explain its cause or express its real character. One after another I have thought of some form of expression only to dismiss it as hopelessly inadequate, if not actually false, and in the last resort I am driven back to those two vexatious words which, I am afraid, have often served as a desperate refuge for the muddled thinker—I mean the words objective and subjective. On the whole I think that so far as these words have any meaning at all, that meaning does take us very nearly down to the root of the matter, and it does supply the best account that we can give of the great division. I submit that the Catholic-minded man, if you take him in the lump, is the man who likes his religion presented in an objective way; he wants to see it as something outside of himself and independent of his own feelings and convictions; a church, a sacrament, a priesthood, a ritual; a presentment of the Divine which appeals to his senses from the outside, and which, moreover, will remain though he should pass, and stand though he should fall. That the Protestant, on the other hand, is essentially the person who suspects and dislikes such a present-

ation, and needs a spiritual diet of subjective truth. Religion for him is not so much a system or an act, as a word; The Word is the expression that he loves to use.

It is very significant, by the way, that the characteristic arts of Catholicism are architecture and painting, and of Protestantism literature. Passing from Westminster Abbey to, let us say, the City Temple, one might be tempted to suppose that the real secret of this cleavage that we have in mind is as much a matter of aesthetics as anything else, but those who take that view, who imagine that Catholicism has a monopoly of all the arts, have surely left out of account the written Word. They have forgotten the J document of Genesis, the second Isaiah, the Authorised Version of the Bible, the poetry of Milton and the prose of Bunyan. It is true, no doubt, that Protestantism in many of its manifestations is appallingly ugly, but the reason, I think, is not that the Protestant really likes his religion presented in an ugly form, but that he doesn't want it presented in any outward and visible form at all, and I suppose that an architecturally bad temple seems to him the best substitute, or the least dangerous substitute, for the temple which is not made with hands.

I suggest, then, that the great cleavage which severs Christendom, and which may be broadly indicated to-day by the words Catholic and Protestant, is largely—not entirely, of course—but largely temperamental rather than intellectual, a matter of taste rather than a matter of knowledge. At the first sight this may seem to be a discouraging conclusion, if it be true, because variety of temperament, differences of personal preference and taste, may well prove to be permanent and indestructible. But there is another consideration to be set against this. If differences of taste are permanent, they may be for that very reason the less important, and indeed if we see them aright they may afford no just grounds for any division. Men may agree to differ on a matter of taste when they could never agree to differ on a matter of knowledge, or a matter of principle.

Pardon a trivial, and perhaps unseemly illustration. Suppose Mr. S. and I should have an embittered argument about the precise length of the first hole at the N.S. golf links. It would be impossible and intolerable that we should agree to differ on such a point. We should forthwith set about to surmount every obstacle that lay between us and N.S. At all costs we should obtain a tape measure, we should discover the fact, and one or other of us would be given the lie in his teeth. But suppose, on the other hand, our point of difference was of another kind; that we were discussing, not the length of the first hole, but the relative attractiveness of the first and the second. In this case our difference could hardly be composed by a visit to the course, a tape measure would be of no avail; it is a matter of taste, and in such a matter we must sooner or later be content to agree to differ. Now I submit that in relation to those great and sacred things that make the content of our religion when once we have determined that our diversity is a matter of taste, we ought to be willing to agree to differ, and our differences ought not to be regarded as a bar to unity, though they must of necessity be a bar to anything in the nature of uniformity.

I have spoken of intellectual differences and temperamental differences, but I recognise, and this after all is the supremely important consideration, that there are not, and never have been, any spiritual differences in the family of God. I believe that the unity of the Spirit has always been, and still is, a real thing, far more real than any of our unhappy divisions. Whether it will ever manifest itself in an outward and visible unity must depend, as it seems to me, first, on our readiness to co-operate without prejudice and without reserve in the pursuit of knowledge and the quest of truth, and so at least to approach the goal of intellectual agreement; and, secondly, on our willingness frankly to accept, recognise and allow those natural temperamental divergencies of taste and personal preference which can only be destroyed by the destruction of personality itself.

ROBERTSON OF BRIGHTON, 1816—1853.*

By the Rev. Felix Asher, B.D., Incumbent of Holy Trinity Church, Brighton.

"Go stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this Life."—*Acts v.* 20.

When this command was first given, the temple and its precincts at Jerusalem were, in some sense, an epitome of the religious life of the world. Jews from all parts of the Roman empire dwelt in and around the city and worshipped in its temple. Gentiles (as we know from John xii. 20) were to be found in the outer court, striving to blend their prayers with the upward striving movement of the spirit of the sacrificial system, symbolised in the ritual of the inner courts. The religious world surrounding the Mediterranean was to be found in miniature in the city of Jerusalem, and re-focussed for purposes of worship in its temple. But on looking more closely deep clefts become visible. The worship was unsatisfying except to the priests who conducted it and their families. The worshippers themselves were divided into well-known groups or schools, and were led and kept separate by pious lofty leaders of great ability and distinction. The devout Greek or Roman proselyte experienced the spirit of race as a dividing force separating him from the Jew in whose temple he worshipped. It was a divided religious world which was striving to worship God in the temple at Jerusalem.

Into one unnoticed part of this divided religious world came the band of tenacious and humble believers in a new life in Christ. Fresh from prison, and thriving by opposition, the apostles heard words from heaven which assured them that the vital impulse by virtue of which they had become believers, was still unspent. They were to become propagators of their

* The substance of a sermon preached in Holy Trinity Church, Brighton, on Feb. 6th, 1916, the Sunday following the 100th anniversary of Robertson's birth.

belief to a divided and dissatisfied, or wrongly satisfied, religious world. "Go stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this Life." They were called to make worship a reality because they had in them the life of unity which could make worship real. In this task they succeeded, and before the Temple fell in A.D. 70 they had made worship once more reasonable and vital and spiritual. The words and doings of their contemporary worshippers are forgotten now, but of these men who had received from Jesus Christ the new impulse which first of all reconsecrated the temple and its services, and then prepared men for its dissolution, we have records which have never failed to enrich the service of God with Truth and Life.

1. Now we may say that the worshipping world of 1847—1853 (the period of Robertson's ministry here in Brighton) was in many respects similar to that of Jerusalem. Think of France at this period. It is after 1848, and the disappointments of the reaction under Pius IX., that real anti-clericalism began to show itself in such men of distinction as Victor Hugo, Quinet, Michelet, and Sainte Beuve. Liberal Catholicism was a failure, de Lammenais had renounced the Church system in the interests both of human society and his republican ideals. Lacordaire, now a Dominican, was striving to combine the religion of Rome with the fluctuating radicalism of Paris. It was found to be as difficult and impossible to be a liberal Catholic as to be a "liberal arithmetician." By the lake of Geneva the lonely Amiel was struggling with those spectral illusions of his in which he just succeeded in preserving himself as a Christian from absorption in The All. In Germany the worshipping world was becoming more and more infected with the septic dust that had been diffused by the arid studies of the scientific critics of the 20 years previous to 1847. Relentless critics had a free hand, and were reconstructing the history of Christ and his apostles entirely to suit their ideas of what must have happened. It is not unfair to say that then, as now, the German "historical" mind tended to declare what must

have been rather than seek to know what probably was. Rothe, at Heidelberg, was an exception, and he was preserving his sense of God in Christ as the only means of throwing any light on the world in which we live. In America, Channing had died in 1842, and Emerson was taking his place as a spiritual leader. But Emerson was impatient with all history, and only wished to use its records to illustrate and decorate the vastly more interesting present in which he lived; he was impatient with the Bible because its revelation seemed to be bound up with odd Hebrew names and features long ago dead, while he wanted a revelation which took its sole illustrations from the robin redbreast and the actual hickory tree by the road side, not from the almug tree and the pelican.

In our own land the Oxford movement, after Newman's secession in 1845, was setting up fixed standards of authority chosen from the dominant ideas and customs of the early Church, and of the Caroline divines; a sustained austerity and a romantic self-dedication to God through ecclesiastical beauty and order gave this movement a real magnetic power over minds that were seeking guidance. Evangelicalism was adapting itself to the early Victorian individualism, and had not succeeded in freeing its doctrine of salvation from the sanctions of self regarding ideas. Jowett in Oxford was entering on that long dream of his which began with a vision of St. Paul, and ended with a beautiful and clear vision of the thought of Plato. Frederick Myers (the father of F. W. H. Myers), at St. John's, Keswick, was formulating a series of detached and liberal thoughts on the Bible and the Church, but they were lacking in pungency. Carlyle having completed his self-determined course of development from which he surveyed—in lectures which have not been preserved—"the spiritual history of the world," had now become a spiritual monolith too big to be builded into any church system. Martineau was already losing his belief in the idea of the Christ, but was deepening his reverence for the actual Jesus. It is interesting to observe that Martineau found the whole conception of Messiah or

Christ otiose and embarrasing, and was beginning that attempt to re-constitute Christianity on the basis of the filial consciousness of Jesus, and to reconcile the story in the gospels with modern requirements by dropping the eschatalogical and Messianic elements altogether as misleading additions of the disciples' ignorance. Maurice and Kingsley were making their vehement assertions—full of prophetic ardour, and blending with the regenerate and unregenerate aspirations of their day—of the actual existence in men's midst of a kingdom of God which would be revealed afresh amid all the disorders and upheavals which were then shaking the political foundations of Europe.

In some such way as this we may represent the worshipping world of Robertson's day, and I do not think there is any tendency which was then working in men's minds with any force, which he did not feel acutely and deeply. The political unrest, the enfranchisement of the individual mind, the travail pangs of democracy, the dissatisfaction with mere traditional interpretations, the respect for scientific training and outlook, the craving for rest in God, the testing of all constituted authority—all these impulses, in their nascent forms, met in him and received a new meaning, a new form, as he worked them into the tissue of his life, and thence into his sermons.

Robertson's influence as a spiritual interpreter was, as you know, little short of marvellous. It can be truly said that there was no difficulty or doubt of his day, however fundamental, which he did not meet, and—to those who believe in his teaching—transform. In his life-time men of all ranks, and of all degress of experience of life, found in his daring words the message which brought them once more into the ranks of Christian worshippers. After his death—and this is the real test—his sermons were published from full notes, and five volumes of these ran through twelve or thirteen editions in a few years. Even now, in 1916, his sermons are still read eagerly, and have the same remarkable power of enlivening that which seemed to be dead, and of showing that the way of

life towards God is not blocked, and that all may tread it if they will, and find it good.

2. "But" you will say, "what was his message?"

Now one striking feature of Robertson's influence is that he seemed to be unable to react on all the tendencies of his day without recourse to the Bible as the inspired interpretation of the upward striving life of the whole world. It was to the Bible he turned to find light on the problem of salvation outside the invisible Church, *i.e.*, among the noble heathen. It was to the Bible he turned when he wished to speak on the rival claims of capital and labour. The illusiveness of all life, and yet its glorious future, the depths of loneliness, the horrors of evil, the victorious character of all true faith,—all these deep human experiences he found embodied in the Bible, and he drew them forth in all their freshness—but amid profound suspicion from contented orthodoxy—and endued them with new life-giving power.

But he had a key to the Bible. A close study of his sermons and of his letters shows that to be so; "The infinite mind of Christ" was the sole key to understanding what the Bible is meant to teach us. It is probable that many "liberal" Christians have some difficulty here in following his teaching, but his teaching is plain; from all eternity Christ was the Humanity of Deity, and Christ when He becomes incarnate is not super-human, but completely human. This complete Humanity is the sign of the Divinity of Christ, and constitutes the measure of all human life. From all eternity He could do nothing of Himself, nor can we. The universe came into being through His obedience, and after His completer incarnate obedience on the cross, humanity, being redeemed, has become a new creation. In harmony with the infinite mind of Christ, you may at last understand the laws of the universe, and enter into the real eternity, which is Love. The love of Christ for God and for us men is realised by us, and is reproduced in us when we acquiese in all He did for us, and ask God to accept it on our behalf, because He who sees our loving faith in Christ,

alone can interpret that faith and reckon it as containing a craving and aspiration to be and do all that Christ was, and has done for us, which, however, we can never—because of our own sinfulness—accomplish; yet we are saved by faith in Christ.

Robertson found Christ everywhere. If promises of perpetual royalty are made to King David, he says simply, "The promises to David are to the Christ within David, therefore they are applied to the Christ when He appears."

The homage of the Magi is the prophecy of the adoration which science makes to the true King of men, the Christ who rules by yielding up His will in love to the Father. The Epiphany of Christ means that "God is the Father of the world, with a star for the Magi, a celestial melody for the Hebrew shepherd, and an unsyllabled voice for all the humble and inquiring spirits in His world." In devotion to Christ, thus both revealed and revealing, Robertson found the peculiar Christian form of peace which not only "subsists at the heart of," but is the cause of "endless agitation." I know not how to describe the strange union of inner rest and outer pertubation which go to make up Robertson's life, and which gave birth to his marvellous creative power. He is an enigma to many, but he has still a message to those who rest in no school of thought, and find no comfort or depth in an unchivalrous attempt to secure selfish security from impending pain, and mental ease in formal blind obedience to a disciplinary authority. The deep mysterious teaching of Christ, who has always been the Friend and Leader of man in his movement upwards towards God, a Christ who as the Eternal Son of God has always been, and will always be the Humanity of Deity, and a Christ who—as seen in Jesus—is known to be the sole leader of man towards the goal known only to the Father—this teaching can awaken in men the deepest response and the utmost sacrifice. Robertson, as you know, was at heart a soldier, and he carried the soldier's instincts and standards with him in all he did, but his was a special kind of soldier-spirit. He was in his stern, loyal,

devotion to Christ like one of the soldiers in the early eighteenth century, who giving up all for the cause which to him was life itself, followed his leader wherever he went. We may with reverence take an old Jacobite song, and substituting the name of the stainless and unselfish Lord for the imperfect human leader who first inspired it, say that the following words truly suggest the attitude of Robertson to the Christ whom he adored and followed:—

> "Follow Thee! follow Thee! who would not follow Thee!
> Long hast Thou loved us and trusted us fairly."

I have said that Robertson (who knew more than most men of Nature and the Poets, and studied science with rigour and philosophy with patience) found his real power of reaction on the world in the Bible, and his only key to the Bible in the infinite mind of Christ. In saying this I believe I have gone to the heart of the matter. But how much more remains to be said. How shall I speak of the stringency and sternness which he shewed to every form of pride and tyranny, or of the tenderness which he displayed in word and in deed to every struggling form of upward-striving life? Remember how he re-interpreted Baptism, Absolution, the Sabbath Day, and the Atonement. Read his sermons on these subjects, and see whether we have yet absorbed their teaching. How he has revealed to us the loneliness, the sympathy, the unbounded love of Christ! Has any man done more to reconcile us to God by showing us that only in the cross of Christ do we see the love of God mirrored so that we may behold it and live?

I am not disposed to deny the element of restlessness which his teaching induces. I doubt not that he needs supplementing. But surely his vision was true. Surely his message will yet bring souls to birth in this world for which Christ died. Far be it from me to attempt to magnify him—"a name magnified is a name destroyed." Let him take his place with others in the goodly company of the prophets, and let us learn from him and from them to turn worship into life.

3. Do you ask still further: "What was the secret of Robertson's message so far as it is good for us to know it?"

The first answer to be given to this is, I think, that within the recesses of his mind he had an unusual power of interpenetration. The ideas which came to him through his heightened sensitiveness, and the limits which he perceived through his strictly logical mind, were interfused but never confused. To-day this seems a lost art, but Robertson had it almost to perfection. He had no raw, crude truths: everything that he said was instinct with life, and this vitality was due to the length of time which he kept the truths within his soul until they should be "endued with power from on high."

Another answer may be gathered in an indirect manner. All creative men, such as he was, have a secret, and it is revealed, or as much as we may know is revealed, casually, indirectly and without self-consciousness, and generally to someone on a lower plane of experience. On Jan. 6th, 1849, Robertson was addressing a body of young men and women who had recently been confirmed, and were to come on the following Sunday to Holy Communion. His subject was the Parable of the Sower, and he touched on the words "They that having heard the word,—keep it." He urged his young hearers to constant meditation in order to keep the word of God in their hearts, saying:—

> "He knows what meditation is who has ever earnestly and sincerely loved one living human being. The image of his friend rises unbidden by day and night, stands before his soul in the street and in the field, comes athwart his every thought and mixes its presence with his every plan. So far all is passive, but besides this he plans and contrives for the other—tries to devise what would give him pleasure—examines his own conduct and conversation to avoid what can by any possibility give pain."
>
> "So, too, is meditation on religious truth carried on. If it be first loved, it will recur spontaneously to the heart. But then it is dwelt on till it receives innumerable applications—is again and again brought up to the sun and tried in various lights, and incorporates itself with the realities of practical existence."

When Robertson spoke these words we may assume that he was thinking of his Redeemer and Lord, Whom—may I say it?—he so gallantly followed, and—this I may say—Whom he so profoundly trusted and adored.

OXFORD THEOLOGY.

By Canon B. H. Streeter, Queen's College, Oxford.

With the greater part of the article on "The Training of the Clergy," in the December number of the *Modern Churchman*, by Prebendary Parsons, I find myself in hearty agreement; but I feel bound to deprecate in the strongest terms his attempt to discourage candidates for Holy Orders from reading the Honour School of Theology at the Universities unless they have previously taken another subject for their B.A.

The question is one of immense practical importance, for the simple reason that *as things now are* for the great majority of Ordinands who pass through the older Universities, the Theology School affords the one chance of acquiring anything like the kind of theological education which would qualify them to understand and deal with the intellectual problems of the present day. I will confine what I have to say to the Honour School of Theology at Oxford, since I have direct experience of that, though I should imagine that *mutatis mutandis* much the same might be said of Cambridge. And at the risk of appearing egoistical I will add that my experience is a wide one. For over 15 years I have taken the whole theology work of two colleges, though not always the same two, rarely having less than ten pupils at a time, and as throughout that period I also took part of the Pass Moderations work in my own College, I have had opportunity to compare the subsequent intellectual development of theological students with that of other men who took Moderations along with them, but subsequently proceeded to different final Honour Schools.

Now, undoubtedly, the best training available for a candidate for Orders is (1) to take for his B.A. *Literae Humaniores,* or if his knowledge of classics is not sufficient for that, English Literature or Modern History; (2) to read next the Honour School of Theology; (3) finally, to take a year at a good Theological College or other place for practical training. This is the ideal course. Diocesan and other funds for training

Ordinands would do far better to spend their money on enabling the abler men who have already taken a Degree to take an extra year at Oxford, instead of helping on to an Oxford Pass Degree men who would get a much better professional training at King's College—where the system enables far better use to be made of weaker material than can be done at Oxford.

But though it is undubitable that a man is the better for taking another Honour School before theology, for financial reasons this is impossible in most cases. It ought not to be, but it is, and we have to deal with facts as they are. In that case he must choose *either* theology *or* some other subject for his B.A. Which should he do? If his general abilities and his knowledge of classics are such as to enable him to do reasonably well in *Literae Humaniores*, he should certainly take that. For "Greats," including, as it does, philosophy, ancient and modern, and ancient history, is the best possible introduction to both the historical and philosophical problems of theology, and with this introduction a man of ability can go a long way in theology without further systematic instruction.

But if he cannot take "Greats," I have no hesitation in saying he had much better read Theology than Modern History, which is the popular alternative; for the following reasons:—

(1) If the men who naturally proceed to "Greats" are deducted, the majority of Candidates for Ordination are men of practical and devotional rather than of intellectual interests. They are only moderately interested in knowledge for its own sake. Unless a subject of study appears to them to have a practical bearing on their life's work, they do not give themselves up to it with any enthusiasm. To an Ordinand theology is such a subject, and my experience is that an Ordinand who is reading theology puts far more interest and work into his studies than he does if he is reading for other Schools. Keen interest is the first condition of spontaneous intellectual activity; it is my experience that men frequently acquire an intellectual interest and develope an intellectual capacity when

reading theology far in excess of anything of which they had previously given promise, or which would have been *in their case* elicited by any subject which did not, in the first place, commend itself to them as being of practical importance. That is to say, considered as a purely intellectual discipline, the study of theology does more for them than any other subject could do.

(2) On its intellectual side the training of the Clergy should be such as to enable them to deal in the pulpit or in conversation with questions of a philosophical and doctrinal character (*e.g.*, the existence of God, the meaning of the Incarnation or Atonement), with ethical problems and with questions of evidence, especially as those are presented in dealing with problems of *Ancient History*, which differs much as regards the problem of evidence from Modern History. Theology as taught half-a-century ago was, doubtless, open to the charge of being an inferior intellectual training, and one that tended to a narrow outlook. Theology studied in the light of modern critical methods is not open to this reproach. Its educative value, of course, will depend to some extent on the particular College Tutor, but that is true of any subject; and most of the Theological Tutors in Oxford are men who have themselves read some other School before taking theology, and know how to make the best of the subject as a means of intellectual training as well as for its own sake. And the subject is one which lends itself to this. A man who cannot read "Greats" gets a better intellectual training out of the theology *as now taught* than out of Modern History or English Literature. St. Paul's Epistles are as good a mental discipline as the ethics of Aristotle. Dogmatics as now studied is a most valuable training in clear thinking. The criticism of Old and New Testament is an unique training in historical method, and if more men were encouraged to offer philosophy of religion as one of their subjects, the Honour School of Theology would become a miniature "Greats."

(3) Every year a certain number of men, who come to the University with the intention of taking Orders, change their minds. In most cases this is due to intellectual difficulties. It

is my experience that if a man reads theology the danger of this is very much diminished, for two good reasons (*a*) along with the difficulties, which must occur to everyone in the atmosphere of a modern University, he has solutions brought before his notice in the ordinary course of his reading; (*b*) he is brought into intimate relations with a tutor who has necessarily given special thought to these precise problems.

The notion that a prolonged period of, say, two years at a Theological College will compensate a man for not having studied theology at the University is fallacious.* There are certain things a Theological College can do better than a University, but, in the nature of the case, no Theological College can have on its staff a sufficient number of professors and specialists to make its purely theological training in any way comparable to that which a University can provide.

Those who are inimical to all movement in theology have for years past steadily discouraged men from reading the Honour School on the ground that it fosters a dangerous liberalism in theology. Sometimes this is frankly stated, more often the argument used is that theology is a limited and narrow subject, and that at the University a man should seek a broad, general education. Thus, what is in practice the best opportunity for a training in a constructive and sober liberalism—the only one available for most men—is attacked on the ground of illiberalism. And this plea is so subtle that it is apparently able "to deceive even the elect"—under which heading I am bound to classify my old friend Prebendary Parsons!

* As the Theological Colleges and their systems are at present constituted, Canon Streeter's conclusion is correct. If, however, groups of Theological Colleges would combine, and not only widen their curriculum but also initiate a system of exchange of lectures between themselves (and herein I should include Nonconformist Colleges), as well as seeking to make use of outside theological teachers, *e.g.*, those in our Universities, who are often only too willing to read valuable papers and to give short courses of lectures on subjects in which they are masters, each Theological College might become a centre of eager theological learning and of adequate theological teaching, and have a curriculum more stimulating and also more extensive than the ordinary man reading for the Theological Schools at Oxford and Cambridge is usually able to secure. Moreover, the student would have an atmosphere of theological interest and of personal contact which cannot always be secured at the University. There is one more qualification necessary for the realisation of such a scheme, and that is that the Principal and his staff should themselves be ardent theological teachers and students.—Ed. *M.C.*

THE OUTFIT OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN.

III.—His Prayer Book.

By the Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig, M.A., Vicar of St. Sepulchre's, Holborn Viaduct, E.C.

The Prayer Book does not stand upon the same level as the Bible. It is the property of a part and not of the whole of the Church. It is largely the product of one age in the history of that part of the Church and therefore must be subject to obvious limitations. Yet the English Book of Common Prayer has probably exercised a wider, if not a deeper, influence than any other collection of liturgical forms that has ever been compiled in the Christian Church. That is due to the fact that, being written in the vulgar tongue, it has been from the first not the book of the clergy alone but of the people. It possesses an advantage in this respect over other liturgies the extent of which can hardly be estimated.

We have to ask ourselves to-day in what sense is the Prayer Book part of the outfit of the modern Churchman? Here again we shall encounter something similar to that which we have already noticed in the case of the modern Churchman's World and His Bible. He lives in the same world as others, yet he looks out upon it with modern eyes, he interprets it in a way of his own. He reads the old Bible that other Churchmen read, but he understands it differently. So it is with the Prayer Book. The old Prayer Book is still part of the outfit of the modern Churchman, but his attitude to it and, in some sense at any rate, his practical use of it, is different from that of other Churchmen. If I were to try to describe in two words this attitude of the modern Churchman towards the Book of Common Prayer, the words which I should use would be affection and criticism. The Prayer Book holds a place in his affections which it can never lose. It is endeared to him by the most sacred memories and associations. It is inextricably bound up with the very beginnings of his religious life. Years of use and familiarity have only served to strengthen his attachment to it. The words of many of its services—the

Confirmation Service, the Marriage Service, the Baptismal Service, the Burial of the Dead, and perhaps the Ordination Service—have been used by him or for him at all the most solemn moments of his life. The perfect rhythm of its language, the incomparable felicity of many of its phrases, the stately music of its devotions, all this and much beside, holds him like a spell that nothing can ever break. For the English Churchman the Book of Common Prayer belongs to the very fabric of his religion.

But affection is not inconsistent with criticism. Love must not make us blind to obvious defects and blemishes. It may even serve to open our eyes to them more clearly. We may as well recognise the fact that there is no school of thought within the Church which is perfectly satisfied with the Prayer Book as it is, and that this has been the case from the very first. The Prayer Book was a compromise from the beginning;—an extraordinarily successful compromise no doubt;—but still a compromise. It has been a bond of union between men of different ages and of differing temperaments, and almost all those who have used it have done so wishing that some things which it contains might be changed. I have heard some Churchmen say that they would not have a single word in the Prayer Book altered, but these are very rare. Most of us, whatever our particular leanings may be, combine affection and criticism in our attitude towards the Prayer Book. What is characteristic of the modern Churchman is that his criticism goes perhaps a little deeper than that of others. He discriminates more carefully between one part of the Prayer Book and another. He assigns very different values to different parts. Let me try to illustrate what I mean.

There are some parts of the Prayer Book which a modern Churchman would willingly see left out altogether. He can no longer use them with any sense of profit or of edification, and he feels that they are quite unsuitable for public worship. The cursing psalms, the Athanasian Creed, the Commination Service, to take three examples, are things of which he would

be inclined to say, the sooner we learn to do without them the better. They may have an historical interest no doubt, but not only do they fail to express in any real sense the living faith of the Church, but they are a serious offence and stumbling block to many devout minds. He would ask for sufficient liberty at any rate to discontinue their use.

There are other parts of the Prayer Book about which a modern Churchman feels that although they do not require such drastic treatment, yet they contain so much that is merely antiquated that a large measure of revision is required. He is still content to use them very much as they stand, but in doing so he finds a great deal that he cannot fully endorse or assimilate. They are expressed in technical language which has lost its meaning, or they contain dogmatic statements which go far beyond the actual belief of most of us. The Baptismal service, with its insistence on the doctrine of the fall, its repeated references to original sin, and the very precise language which it uses about regeneration, seems to be based upon a view of human life, and of the relation of God to man which is no longer held by the great majority of educated Churchmen. The Ordination Service seems to give its sanction to a view of the Christian ministry which is at once too exclusive and too definitely sacerdotal in its character, and is at the same time a view which history can no longer justify. The moving symbolism of baptism and ordination is to some extent marred by the presence of these ideas which do not belong to the essence of the rite. While he uses these services the modern Churchman feels that there is much which jars upon his ears and even weakens their effect for him. He would like to see some careful revision which would set free the essential beauty of the ancient rite from the accretions of theological dogma which have grown up around it.

There are other services in the Prayer Book where the need of substantial change hardly exists at all. The modern Churchman can enter into them without any feeling of unreality or any conscious sacrifice of that sincerity which ought to be

inseparable from all worship of God. One of these services at any rate is among the most important of all. We shall return on another occasion to this subject, meanwhile we may remark that the service of the Holy Communion is perhaps the one service in the Book of Common Prayer which to the mind of the modern Churchman is least in need of change, and we may regard it as a matter for no common thankfulness that whereas on many other points he feels compelled to differ, and often to differ widely from other Churchmen, yet in that which is their closest act of fellowship with one another in Christ, he finds himself in fuller sympathy both with form and with expression than at any other time.

We cannot leave this subject without touching for a moment upon one of its practical aspects. For some ten years past the question of Prayer Book revision has been before the Church in a practical form, and we are probably approaching the time when definite proposals will be presented to the Church for acceptance. The movement in favour of revision has gathered strength, but it has met with considerable opposition from more quarters than one. The modern Churchman will naturally support Prayer Book revision. All his leanings are in that direction, and even though it does not go as far as he could wish, he will welcome it when it comes. But at the same time he will not build up any very extravagant hopes upon it. He will recognise that whatever its final shape may be, no one will get all that he wants. The new Prayer Book will not satisfy everybody any more than did the old. He will still be conscious of defects for which no remedy has been provided. There will still be need of some amount of mental reservation and accommodation in using whatever liturgical forms may be agreed upon. That need not distress us. For it will always be the case that our worship, our praises, our prayers, and our penitence must find expression through human channels. The channels, just because they are human, will always be imperfect. It is enough for us that imperfect as they are, they can yet express the spiritual longings and aspirations of the soul, and that through them these aspirations may rise to the throne of God, and the soul may enter into communion with Him.

A SPIRITUAL CONFLICT.*

By the Rev. W. Danks, M.A., Canon of Canterbury.

"For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places."—*Ephesians vi.* 12. R.V.

This is one of many passages of Scripture which teach doctrine that has of late, in our times of security, been some what out of fashion; the doctrine that behind the crimes an conspiracies of evil men and deluded nations there is shadowy spiritual power greater than the man or the natio a power which uses them as its willing pawns in resisting th good will of God, and in setting back the order and happines of His world. If St. Paul were here to-day he would se behind the clash of earthly armies the onset of the hosts wickedness in the spiritual world or "heavenly places." these gigantic crimes and cruelties he would see "as in a glas darkly" the promptings of a monstrous hidden enemy whon perhaps, he would name Antichrist. He would look upo what men at the front and women in hospital or in shadowe homes, are doing and bearing in this great struggle agains Antichrist, and he would say:—"These men, wearied, wounde or fallen, these women offering the sacrifice of health or heart desire, they are the comrades and allies of God's celesti armies; of angels and archangels, and all the company heaven."

This feeling about the war as something more than material conflict, as a counterpart on this earthly plane some supreme struggle between spiritual forces, has not bee wholly unknown to our troops in the field, even witho St. Paul to remind them. Whether or not there were ange at Mons, the mere stories of them show that some, at leas had a sense of immortal powers and presences. I suppose th moving story called "The Sacrament" in the *Spectator* f

* A Sermon preached in Canterbury Cathedral on Intercession Sunday, 1916.

Christmas Day (December 25th, 1915) is pure imagination, but it rings with a kind of truth surpassing the truth of outward fact. It was after the fight. A little over-wearied company of soldiers in a shell-shattered cottage. Their table was an old door supported on biscuit tins, and on it were a bottle of wine and a plate of bread. They were broken-hearted at the death of gallant comrades and leaders whom they loved. As brave men will, they choked back the tears with cheerful words and dry jests. A strange officer entered, and without knowing why, they all stood up. "We must cheer up," he said. "After all, it is the day of sacrifice. It is the day of testing." He gave a faint gesture with his hands as he spoke, and I saw a great scar in the middle of each one of them. In the light I thought I saw blood. "You're wounded, Sir," I said. "That was long ago," he answered, "but whenever one of them falls I feel the pain. When your comrade, Geoffrey, fell, I knew how you fellows would all feel it. Geoffrey's death was a sacrifice. He was the only child left to his parents. Yet they are not repining. They are wondering why, but they are satisfied it was right for him to die." After a pause he added:—"It is the day of sacrifice and the beginning of greater troubles. England does not really understand. She does not remember the lessons of the past. So many of her teachers have been blind." He changed his tone a little, and looking round on us all he said: "But I want you all to drink a little to cheer you up. After all, where is the faith to-day if it is not among you fighting men? Come, let us take a little bread together, and remember the day of agony when the Soldier Son died." He broke the bread in his scarred hands, passing it to each one of us. He poured out the wine into the tumbler, and we took it one from the other and drank silently. "Let us think of the day," he said, "when your dead friends will hear again the bugle call and meet you on the field of the great victory. But there's only one thing that counts now, and that is Duty. And if England does her duty she will purge out every offending thing and learn the meaning of the fellowship

of saints. And it will help you all to remember the death of the Son as you have done to-night, and that you are following his steps. Good-night to all of you." And with this farewell he was gone, out into the wet and windy night.

To know that we are waging a spiritual war as well as a material one, that we are fighting for honour and mercy and freedom, as well as for victory, for the Kingdom of God as well as for the British Empire, that we are leagued with all good spirits and heavenly powers against darkness, and lust, and lies, and cruelty, this is the first step toward the right use of a Day of Intercession. For in our prayer, be it long or short, if only it be real, we are taking part in the war on the spiritual plane. We may be unable, through age or sex or weakness, to hold a trench, but not one of us is unable to pray. We can all enlist in God's great unseen army; we can re-dedicate ourselves and our country to His service; we may have been, in some sense, deserters or shirkers, but it is not too late. We can be enrolled among the spiritual powers behind or among our fighting men; we can add our pleading, our resolve, our penitence, our self-denial to the secret forces that make a good cause invincible.

> "My prayer hath power with God: the grace
> Unspeakable I now receive.
> Through faith I see Thee face to face,
> I see Thee face to face and live."

The second step to the right use of a Day of Intercession is to believe this: to believe that our prayer *is* a power.

How and why it is a power, is one of the thousand things in this universe which we cannot fully understand. We cannot tell how it operates or how it will be answered. But if there is anything to which men of all races, all religions, and all times have testified it is to the power of prayer. None have felt it more deeply than great soldiers and sailors fighting in a good cause. Let me remind you of three prayers before battle recorded in our English history. Nearly 1,300 years ago (in A.D. 635), before this country was a single kingdom, when it was divided among kinglets, some Christian, some

pagan, Oswald, the Christian king of Northumbria, had to fight for his throne and his life with the heathen. Raising his voice he cried to his army:—

> "Let us all kneel and together beseech the almighty, living, and true God . . . for He knoweth that we have undertaken a just war for the saving of our nation."

Oswald and we join hands and prayers across 13 centuries. His bidding is the bidding of King and Archbishop to-day. A thousand years later (in 1642), Sir Jacob Astley, a stout soldier of King Charles, before the battle of Edgehill, said:—

> "O Lord, Thou knowest how busy I must be this day. If I forget Thee, do not Thou forget me."

That has been the unspoken prayer of many a man on desperate duty in France, Flanders, and Gallipoli. That should be one of our prayers to-day for our troops and for ourselves, that in all times of stress and strain when, for very pressure to instant action, words and thoughts of God forsake us, His guidance and care may be upon us and all we do. A hundred and sixty-three years later Nelson was on his knees in his cabin before Trafalgar:—

> "For myself, I commit my life to Him that made me, and may His blessing alight on my endeavours for serving my country faithfully. To him I resign myself and the just cause which it is entrusted to me to defend. Amen. Amen. Amen."

God accepted the sacrifice of his life, and gave him an immortal name and his country a hundred years of safety from foreign foes. So is God accepting the sacrifice of British lives to-day, and we will pray on this our Intercession Day that the sacrifice may redeem, not only the world from the onslaught of a brutal and heartless tyranny, but will also redeem this land we love from the sins, the follies, and the blindness which enslave and degrade her. We will also pray that those who for us have made this great offering, and have passed from the earthly to the heavenly armies, may in that other life see of the travail of their soul and be satisfied.

The men whom I have called to mind were not clergymen or missionaries, or Sunday school teachers. They were not even men of blameless character and unspotted record. They

were just men of the old British fighting stock, who tried, and sometimes failed, to do their duty as they saw it, and believed in a God who gave power to their prayers. Such men were Havelock and Outram and Nicholson and Gordon and Roberts, and many more. And we dare to think that when you pray, to-day, for your soldiers and sailors, your country and the world, these will be with you in spirit and join their prayers to yours, though they be for a while divided from you by the "narrow stream of death."

These, then, are thoughts which will make real and availing your Intercessions. You will remember that you are not only men and women walking this earth in bodily form and substance, but spirits taking your part in the great war between good and evil.

> "One army of the living God,
> To His command we bow;
> Part of the host have crossed the flood,
> And part are crossing now."

You will believe, like your fathers of old time, like your famous soldiers and sailors, that prayer is a power, and is gathered by God among all his forces and influences for good. You will ask forgiveness and repentance for yourselves and your people, that you may be worthy to re-dedicate yourselves to His service, and enlist in His armies of earth and heaven. You will give thanks for the victorious dead: for all who, by their prayer and faith and agony, have built up this Empire, or have died to defend it; for the great uplift of soul which has filled our armies with men, and our men with devotion and daring; for the women who minister to our sick and wounded; for the years of peace and security which now seem long ago; for the knowledge of God's love in Christ, and for His long patience with our follies and sins. You will plead that He will bear with us yet awhile longer and pardon our slavery as a nation to drink and lust and pleasure and money. Finally, you will pray that He will deliver us from that defeat and forfeiture of our mission in the world which we have deserved by our unreadiness, our bitter divisions, the time-serving of our politicians, and the party spirit of their followers.

REVIEW.

MR. BALFOUR'S "THEISM AND HUMANISM."*

Mr. Balfour begins this book by some exceedingly modest and apologetic remarks. He delights to assume the rôle of a plain man writing for plain men, rather than a philosopher writing for philosophers. I will not say that there is no difference between Mr. Balfour's manner of approaching his subject and that of most professional philosophers, but I venture to think that he exaggerates the difference. Mr. Balfour is a philosopher, and his arguments are philosophical arguments. Nay, in spite of the protest that he has no metaphysical system, he is a metaphysician, if perhaps a metaphysician *malgrè lui*. Nor, though he makes so much parade of appealing on plain grounds to the plain man, can it be said that his lines of argument have anything particularly "popular" or "plain" or easy about them. They are subtle lines of thought, if they do not always (as it will appear to other philosophers) get quite to the root of the matter. The fact is that Mr. Balfour's mind is more impressed by what seem to some of us bye-arguments —subtle and subordinate lines of thought—than by any of the main and well-worn lines of philosophical attack. He prefers to approach the metaphysical citadel by ingenious methods of surprise rather than by frontal attacks. No doubt there are minds—especially perhaps minds with some scientific but little or no philosophical training—which will be more impressed by Mr. Balfour's methods than by those usual among professed philosophers; the very depreciation of metaphysicians and apparent absence of "Dogmatism" will propitiate many. The suspicion which will arise in the mind of the impenitent "metaphysician" will probably be that at bottom Mr. Balfour's arguments imply and involve one or other of the old lines of thought, and are only valid if these are presupposed.

Mr. Balfour begins with an introductory lecture in which he indicates the method to be pursued. It is the method of examining our "inevitable beliefs"—the beliefs practically assumed and acted upon by ordinary people, including men of science, and enquiring what is implied in them. Many philosophers would say that is just the method of all philosophy—of all philosophy at least which is not avowedly sceptical and destructive. Certainly it is the method of just those philosophers whom Mr. Balfour would look upon as pre-eminently "metaphysical," and even "dogmatic." Certainly it was the method not only of Kant but of Hegel. Mr. Balfour apparently thinks that he differentiates himself from these by the remark that "there are inevitable beliefs which nobody would think of describing either as *a priori* or axiomatic" (p. 14). The distinction is important, and the implied criticism upon certain philosophers is not without some foundation. Metaphysicians have been too much in the habit of conducting their enquiry into the beliefs implied in our common knowledge as if every such

* *Theism and Humanism*, being the Gifford Lectures for 1914-15, by Right Hon A. J. Balfour; Hodder & Stoughton, Price 10/6 net.

belief necessarily amounted, even when taken isolatedly and by itself, to a self-evident axiom, or that, if it cannot be treated in that way, it must be dismissed as merely gratuitous and illusory; that, if, for instance, induction implies the uniformity of nature, the uniformity of nature must be treated as a self-evident axiom, while he who denies that it is so must admit that he has no ground at all for trusting the results of induction. Mr. Balfour returns to this point later in his argument, and I shall have something to say about it hereafter. But these are questions of detail; to admit that Mr. Balfour has much to say for himself on this head is not to say that he has succeeded in drawing a fundamental distinction between his method and that of the metaphysicians.

Mr. Balfour then proceeds to examine the argument from design—apparently because that, among all the recognized philosophical "proofs" of the existence of God, is the one which resembles most closely an appeal to "common-sense." There is an admirable statement of the difference which Darwinism has made to the argument, and an admirable indication of the way in which that argument may be re-stated in a post-Darwinian form. This has never been done better in so few pages, but I forbear to quote because the argument is suggested only to be set aside. Mr. Balfour concludes "that the common sense 'argument from design' is still of value. But, if it carries us beyond mechanical materialism, it must be owned that it does not carry us very far towards a religious theology. It is inconsistent with Naturalism; it is inconsistent with Agnosticism. But its demands would be satisfied by the barest creed which acknowledged that the universe, or part of it, showed marks of intelligent purpose" (p. 43). That is exactly the point which I should like to dispute. I believe it could be shown that the assumption of some very limited intelligence in parts of the universe—an intelligence which (as some would suggest) is itself undergoing a process of growth and expansion—will not serve to explain the "design" which Mr. Balfour admits. And nobody, one might have supposed, would have been better qualified than Mr. Balfour to follow up that line of argument; but, with his characteristic aversion for frontal attacks, Mr. Balfour turns aside to a much more indirect method of attack upon Materialism and Naturalism.

His argument, he tells us, is "not an argument from design, but an argument from values." It is an attempt to show that the values which we all in practice more or less explicitly recognize would be lost if we supposed that they were the product, as they must be on a naturalistic assumption, of mere accident. From a naturalistic point of view all our beliefs are ultimately caused by blind, unintelligent forces. If our beliefs were so caused, we should have no guarantee of their validity. Here Mr. Balfour repeats the well-known argument of his previous works. If we believe $2+2=4$ merely because a series of physical causes have engendered that belief in our brain, we have no guarantee that the belief is not a mere delusion—helpful perhaps in the struggle for existence, but none the less, it may be, false. A materialistic view of the universe is therefore suicidal; it cuts at the roots of the premises upon which it argues. Similarly, Mr. Balfour now contends, if we were really convinced of the purely material origin of our confidence in these values—aesthetic, ethical, and scientific,—the values would themselves

disappear; and this consequence cannot be escaped by any non-materialistic system which stops short of definite, "personal" Theism.

First, Mr. Balfour endeavours to apply this principle to the aesthetic sphere. He insists upon the improbability that something which we judge to be of so much value as aesthetic experience should be the product of mere chance. Such experiences possess no survival value: there is nothing from the merely naturalistic or merely biological point of view to explain them. It would therefore seem highly improbable that they should exist at all in a Universe which is as indifferent to questions of value as the materialist's Universe must be. This is of course merely a particular application of the argument from design; and so far I should fully admit its force, merely remarking that it is difficult to estimate that force when it is isolated from other applications of the same argument: the only feature which gives it any especial significance is the complete uselessness of these higher aesthetic experiences from the naturalistic standpoint. But this is not Mr. Balfour's main point. He goes on to argue that the value of the experiences would disappear—altogether or very largely—if we could believe that the beauty which we contemplate was not intended or did not constitute a revelation of some spiritual being beyond or behind the beautiful object. It is admitted that something of the beauty of a poem or a picture would disappear if we could suppose that it had no meaning intended by a conscious and purposeful Artist—that it was a mere chance product of mechanism. (I am not sure that there is not some exaggeration even here: it would lose some of its value for us, but not all. If Hamlet had been produced by a mechanical Shakespeare, we should lose something, but how much?) In the same way Mr. Balfour argues that natural beauty would lose its value if we did not suppose that there was not, so to speak, a divine Artist behind the Beauty. There is here a very interesting disquisition on the strictly aesthetic interest involved in the contemplation of History, and the same argument is applied to this particular kind of beauty. "The history which concerns us is the history of self-conscious personalities, and of communities which are (in a sense) self-conscious also. Can the contemplative values which this possesses, especially in its most comprehensive shape, be regarded as independent of our world-outlook? Surely not." (p. 89). Now here I am sorry to have to confess that I cannot find Mr. Balfour's argument at all convincing. He does not seem to me to grapple at all successfully with the obvious objection that many persons extremely sensitive to aesthetic pleasures have no world-outlook that can be considered even in the vaguest sense spiritualistic—to say nothing of definite Theism. No doubt there are particular veins of feeling which would not be open to such persons. Shelley could not have felt the particular kind of thrill which Wordsworth describes in the poem on Tintern Abbey.[1] It might be difficult to say how much of what he felt could properly be

[1] Though even in this poem Wordsworth speaks of his earlier attitude towards Nature:—

"A feeling and love
That had no need of a remoter charm,
By thought supplied, nor any interest
Unborrowed from the eye."

regarded as a strictly aesthetic experience or how far it ought not to be called a religious emotion mingling with, though inseparable from, the strictly aesthetic emotion. But I see no reason why the other emotions which Shelley did feel in the contemplation of Nature should inevitably be weakened, or ought logically to have been weakened, by the fullest and most deliberate realization of Shelley's negative creed.

Next, Mr. Balfour goes on to apply the same kind of argument to the question of moral values. Here it is clear that much more caution is required in basing an argument upon the evolutionary uselessness of the qualities to which value is attached. Mr. Balfour admits that up to a certain point moral qualities do possess a survival-value: they might therefore be accounted for by natural selection so far as other kinds of evolution can be accounted for in that way. But when we come to the higher types of character, it cannot be said that they have any natural tendency to promote survival: Huxley, as Mr. Balfour points out, really exaggerated the collision between moral value and survival value: but he was right in holding that the biologically "fittest" does not necessarily represent the type which in our ethical judgements we wish to survive. All this is very familiar ground; the point of Mr. Balfour's argument that, if we thought of the ethical judgements in which we pronounce the highest types of character to have value as mere chance-products of blind forces, we should cease to recognize their validity or to allow ourselves to be influenced by them. "Can we be content," he asks, "to regard the highest loyalties, the most devoted love, the most limitless self-abnegation as the useless excesses of a world-system, which in its efforts to adapt organism to environment has over-shot its mark? I deem it impossible. The naturalistic setting must be expanded into one which shall give the higher ethics an origin congruous with their character. Selection must be treated as an instrument of purpose, not simply as its mimic. Theistic teleology must be substituted for Naturalism. Thus, and thus only, can moral values, as it seems to me, be successfully maintained" (p. 119). Men like Nietzsche have admitted the interdependence of morals (as ordinarily understood) and religion, and have condemned both; men like Huxley have denied the interdependence. "In my opinion, the position is not permanently tenable. I do not mean that it involves a logical contradiction. I do mean that it involves an emotional and doctrinal incompatability of a very fundamental kind. And this is a defect which may be even more fatal than logical contradiction to the stability of ethical beliefs" (p. 120). This position is not the same as Kant's. "In Kant's argument, as I understand it, God was external to morality in the sense that He was not Himself a moral end. It was not our feeling of love and loyalty to Him that was of moment, but His guidance of the world in the interests of virtue and the virtuous. My point is different. I find in the love of God a moral end which reconciles other moral ends, because it includes them. It is not intolerant of desires for our own good. It demands their due subordination, not their complete suppression. It implies loyal service to One who by His essential nature wills the good of all. It requires, therefore, that the good of all shall be an object of our endeavour; and it promises that, in striving for this inclusive end, we shall in Pauline phrase be fellow-

workers with Him" (p. 127). The attempt to establish the validity of moral obligation by an appeal to external "sanctions," *i.e.*, by showing that we shall attain our personal ends by promoting the general good, does not really reconcile the collision of ends; "the conduct appropriate to the highest ideal is pursued from motives characteristic of the lower. . . . But I do suggest that in the love of God by the individual soul, the collision of ends *for that soul* loses all its harshness, and harmony is produced by raising, not lowering the ethical ideal" (p. 126).

Few Theists will fail to accept this admirably expressed account of the harmony which the acceptance of ethical Theism introduces between our sense of the moral obligation which requires us to sacrifice self for others, and our feeling that there is, after all, a reasonableness in the demand that the universe should also recognize our own good as an end which is of the same value as our neighbour's good. In a reasonable universe there must, we feel, be a reconciliation between these ends, and that reconciliation must be effected, not by the higher and impersonal end being made ultimately subordinate to the lower and personal one, but by both becoming elements in an end which includes both. That such a reconciliation can only be found in a theistic view of the Universe, I, for one, should fully admit. But when this fact is made into an argument that the theistic view of the Universe is true, it seems to me that we must make distinctions which Mr. Balfour does not make. And if we made them we should, perhaps, find ourselves committed to a little more metaphysic, or "theory of knowledge," than Mr. Balfour is willing to introduce into his argument. "Theistic Teleology *must* be substituted for Naturalism." What is the exact force of that "must"? Does Mr. Balfour think there is an improbability in supposing that what presents itself to us as the highest thing in life should have an accidental or purely material origin? So far I agree. Or does he mean that, in point of fact, our sense of these higher values would disappear if we did not recognize these judgements of ours as springing from a divine Mind and representing the nature and character of that Mind? That in practice it is extremely difficult to keep up a sense of what a mere metaphysician would call the "objective validity of the Moral Law" when a purely naturalistic view of the Universe is adopted, that religion is the best practical security for the recognition, both in theory and practice, of the obligatory character or objective validity of the Moral Law—this also I should readily admit. But this is not quite the same thing as to say that there is any absolutely necessary connection between the two things. As to whether he holds that there is such connection, Mr. Balfour's language does not seem to me quite clear. Nor is the question one which it is easy to answer by a categorical "yes" or "no." If Mr. Balfour means that a reasonable man would, so far as he is reasonable, necessarily pronounce that for him moral obligation or the intrinsic validity of the concept of duty would have vanished because he has given up believing in God, this is more than I am prepared to say. And, as Mr. Balfour admits that such a position does not involve logical contradiction, perhaps he would not assert it either. If he means that an objectively valid moral law cannot well be understood or explained in a Universe in which spirit (so far as it exists) is the mere chance product of

matter—there, too, I should agree. The idea of Duty seems to claim that the Moral Law is part of the constitution of the Universe, not merely a peculiarity of my mind, or even of the particular species of two-legged animals of which I am a specimen; and it is difficult to explain this conviction without assuming a universal Mind of which this Law is an expression. And still more certainly—when we accept this inference, *obligation* comes to have a kind of meaning and validity which it cannot have without it. It carries with it a conviction that the Universe is on the the side of right with all the consequences as to our future hopes and expectations, both for the individual and for humanity, which may naturally be regarded as the corollaries of that great conviction. Perhaps something of this kind is what Mr. Balfour means by the assertion that the attempt to combine the denial of Theism with the "inevitable belief" in morality involves "an emotional and doctrinal incompatability of a very fundamental kind." I will not pursue the matter further. What I have said will perhaps suffice to illustrate what I meant by saying that Mr. Balfour's line of thought is only an indirect way of approaching just the same problems as are attacked more directly by the metaphysicians from whom he is so anxious to differentiate himself. At bottom, Mr. Balfour is asserting that our moral judgements claim to be objectively valid, and that their objective validity requires Theism as the only postulate which can thoroughly explain and justify that demand. That is a very old philosophical contention. And further, it represents a line of argument the force of which it is extremely difficult to estimate apart from other lines of philosophical thought which Mr. Balfour does not touch upon and perhaps disparages. The existence of the phenomenon commonly called Conscience, is difficult to reconcile with the belief that the Universe is not ultimately reasonable. But it is difficult to say how much weight we should attach to this consideration, apart from other objections to the idea of an unreasonable Universe. At bottom, all Mr. Balfour's arguments require the assumption that the Universe is reasonable. He has given us some reasons of a probable character for believing that the Universe is reasonable; but I am not sure that I should attach much importance to them unless I already believed in and trusted Reason, as Mr. Balfour, on his sceptical side, is not prepared to do. And trust in Reason leads us to one of those "metaphysical systems" which Mr. Balfour regards as so foundationless.

(To be continued.)

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

Manchester Branch.—A meeting of this branch was held at Manchester on Friday afternoon, March 3rd, at 3-30, Professor Canney, as President, being in the chair.

A paper on "Liberal Theology in England in the 19th Century" was read by the Rev. F. E. Hutchinson, Vicar of Leyland, formerly Lecturer in Theology at Magdalene College, Cambridge. Mr. Hutchinson pointed out that his paper was practically identical with a portion of an essay contributed by him to the *Cambridge History of English Literature*. It consisted of an illuminating review of progressive English theology from the opening of the period to the time of the publication of *Essays and Reviews*.

Mr. Hutchinson began by alluding to the reactionary influence upon England of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. He passed on to a consideration of the contributions of Coleridge to our English theology, which had long been suffering from philosophical sterility. He dwelt successively upon the moral power and wide sympathies of Arnold, the religious depth of Erskine, the sure grasp of the facts of Christian experience displayed by Maurice, the phenomenal influence and genius of Robertson. He proceeded to show how more pressing and difficult problems were faced and provided with solutions, along more radical lines, by the courageous scholarship of Jowett and the happy literary genius of Stanley. He then discussed and criticised the notorious *Essays and Reviews*, pointing out that the volume, though too negative in character, was in no sense the unanimous proclamation of subversive principles that it was widely taken to be at the time.

Limitations of time prevented anything but the very briefest of discussions, but the members present were unanimous in their appreciation of Mr. Hutchinson's paper.

Bristol Branch.—On Tuesday, February 15th, at St. Paul's Lecture Room, Clifton, an address was given on "St. Paul and Women," to the local members of the Union, by Miss A. Gardner, lately Fellow and Lecturer of Newnham College, Oxford, now residing in Clifton.

Miss Gardner discussed the subject in relation to the general status of women in apostolic times; the temperament and ideals of St. Paul, and the character of the early Christian assemblies. With regard to St. Paul's injunctions, which cannot be made mutually consistent, she examined his attitude with regard to inferior grades of office; the exercise of charismatic gifts; the provisional character of marriage; and fundamental identity of sex on the spiritual side.

The Rev. J. Gamble, who presided, opened a short discussion, in which the Rev. Canon Haigh and the Rev. Canon Glazebrook took part.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"THE INCARNATION AND THE VIRGIN BIRTH."

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

One cannot read religious papers and magazines without being struck with the anxious tone of apologetic articles and correspondence. The Rev. H. C. Townsend's article in the last *Modern Churchman* is an instance. There would not be this anxiety were it not that the traditional dogmas of Christianity are being seriously called in question. What strikes one further is that the apologists are satisfied with confident assertion of their belief in the dogmas without any attempt to discover what is passing in the minds of many thoughtful and religious persons that constrains them to call in question the dogmas. The apologists fail to recognise the important fact that the mental environment of this twentieth century is wholly different to the early centuries of Christianity. Mr. Townsend allows that we are not "obliged to regard the Bible as infallible." There is no denying the fact that the Bible from beginning to end is geocentric in thought, and symbol, and imagery. It could not have been otherwise. The universe of the Bible was this little planet which was supposed to be a stationary earth round which revolved a firmament in which the sun, and moon, and stars were mere luminaries. From beginning to end of the Bible the conception of God corresponded to the notion of a geocentric universe. God was a supreme Personality above, beyond, separate from the universe, a monarch enthroned in a local Heaven above the sky, who ruled the universe from outside. Thus was begotten in the mind of man a sense of distance, and separation, and disunion between God and man which had to be overcome. In this state of mind men welcomed a Gospel that proclaimed that God was a Trinity, that the Son of God had come down from Heaven to earth, that He had become incarnate in a human form, that thus He had united man to God. This event, which took place late in the history of man on earth, Mr. Townsend, quite in accordance with the creeds, calls "The fundamental fact of the Incarnation." Before this historical event took place there had been no Incarnation of God in human form.

Now our mental environment is wholly different to that of the past. Our universe consists of an infinity of solar systems in which our planet is as a grain of dust. It is an infinite unity. An infinite transcendent ether contains the potentiality of all the worlds, and is immanent in all material substance. Our Heaven is a spiritual reality not spatially distant from earth. Our God is the ultimate reality of all existence—infinite, essential, transcendent, and immanent, Life and Force, Mind and Conscience, Will and Purpose, Wisdom and Truth, Love and Holiness. God as immanent in all existence, and therefore in man, had no need to become incarnate once in time in one man. The Word of God was made flesh in the cosmic evolutionary process that produced man. There never was a time in the history of man in which God was not made flesh, and dwelt among men. The phrases "The Son of God came down from Heaven," "God sent forth His Son," taken literally, belong to the geocentric order of thought.

Mr. Townsend holds that it is not necessary to believe in the Virgin birth of Jesus. It is the fundamental vital fact of "The Incarnation," identified with the birth of Jesus that is for him the matter of supreme importance. He says, "It is when we come to consider the method or manner of the Incarnation that difficulties arise." But the difficulty arises in the modern mind in limiting and identifying "The Incarnation" with the birth and the person of Jesus. The modern mind no longer asks whether the supposed miracles on which traditional Christianity was founded are true, or probable, or possible. With its conception of God it simply sees no necessity for them. Man's immediate relation to God, his essential oneness with God, his possession of eternal life in God, belong to the eternal divine order, they are independent of supposed miraculous incidents that happened nineteen centuries ago.

Right or wrong these are the thoughts that are passing in the minds of thoughtful people at the present time. The Church must take them into consideration. If they are wrong the Church ought to be able satisfactorily to expose the error. If they are right a serious task lies before the Church.

Bristol. C. POYNDER.

[If the Bible be theocentric, does it matter very much if it be geocentric?—ED. *M.C.*]

THROUGH THE MERITS OF CHRIST.

SIR, TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman.*

May I enquire, through the pages of the *Modern Churchman*, whether there is among its readers any "learned clerk" who can tell me at what period in the history of the Christian Church the phrase, "through the *merits* of our Lord Jesus Christ," found its way into the liturgies? The phrase, "through the merits and mediation" of Christ, occurs several times in our Prayer Book, but while there would seem to be ample ground for the second word, or rather for the idea which it expresses, yet, as regards the former, neither the word nor the idea appear to have any scriptural warrant.

The Greek Testament contains numerous examples of both διά with the Genitive (expressing "the means or instruments by which anything is effected") and of διά with the Accusative (expressing "the ground or reason on account of which anything is done"), but it is the former which appears to be invariably used when reference is made to our Lord as the "mediator between God and man," whereas the latter is only used to express the motive for human endeavour. See, for example, Rom. i. 8, v. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 57; 1 Thess. v. 9; Tit. iii. 5, 6; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Peter ii. 5; as contrasted with St. John xii. 9; 1 Cor. iv. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 5; Phil. iii. 7, 8; 1 Peter ii. 13.

Prayer and thanksgivings ascend to God and blessings descend to man, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, never διὰ Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. On the other hand, man himself endures and obeys διὰ Ἰησοῦν. It would, therefore, seem that prayer, &c., is to be offered "through Jesus Christ" as the channel or link between earth and heaven, but not that petitions are to be granted or blessings conferred "because of Jesus Christ," *i.e.*, because of anything he has done, his "merits," in fact.

If the foregoing contention be correct, then surely the triple question arises—(*a*) How and when did such an unscriptural conception of the function of Christ come to be admitted into the liturgical language of the Church? (*b*) Must we not attribute to it much of what was most objectionable in Mediaeval Christianity? And (*c*) Ought not definite steps to be taken to remove from our Prayer Book, both from the Collects and from the Communion Service, a phrase which is as unjustifiable in its origin as it is undesirable in its results?

St. Andrew's Vicarage, Watford. W. FAIRLIE CLARKE.

CHURCH TEACHING IN CHURCH SCHOOLS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

The following may perhaps interest you?

To-day we had our Diocesan Inspection.

INSPECTION OF STANDARD II.

Inspector: "What command did Christ give on Maunday Thursday?"

Children: "Love one another."

Inspector: "Yes, yes, but there is a *greater* command He gave on that day, etc., etc."

INSPECTION OF STANDARDS V. AND VI.

Inspector: "What two commands did Christ give on Maunday Thursday?"

Children: "Love one another." "Do this in remembrance of me."

Inspector: "Very good, very good, and always remember you can't obey the one without obeying the other. You can't love without going to the Holy Communion, and you can't go to the Holy Communion without loving."

[The Headmaster whispered to the Vicar, "Did you ever know any Quakers?"]

Inspector: "What were you made in your Baptism?"

Children: "A child of God."

Inspector: "And what were you before? . . . come, come, surely you all know that! . . . 'A child of wrath' of course. And why were you a child of wrath before you were baptized? . . . Now, come, come, don't you know? Of course, because of Adam's sin."

AN OCCASIONAL CORRESPONDENT.

PRAYER FOR ABSENT FRIENDS.

O HEAVENLY FATHER, from Whom neither time nor space can ever separate us, we know that those who are absent from one another are yet present to Thee, we pray Thee to take into Thy most gracious keeping those dear ones from whom we are now separated, and grant that they and we, by drawing nearer to Thee, may be drawn nearer to one another, that whether or no we meet again on earth, we may yet meet at the Resurrection of the Just and go together into that Home of Many Mansions which Thou hast prepared for all those who faithfully serve Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord.—Amen.